(W Terras of Reference of the Cean mittec are to prepare • comprehcnsivei action plan on environment and pollution control in Delhi.

(c) and (d) The Committsc hat be** asked to submit ita report with/e two mouths.

(e) mil (f) A matter of steps have; already been taken by the Government to control environrmental pollution is Delhi These are as follow*:

(i) Delhi bat been declared as air pollution control area is 1987 under Air- Act, 1981.

(ii) Under Section 21 of the above act every industry has to take consent to establish from Delhi Pollution *Control* Committee and has to co'ntrol its emissions within the prescribed standards. Action is being taken against
all erring units as per provisions of the Ad.

(iii) standards for smoke, earbon monoxide sad hydrocarbons have been prescribed under the Environment Protection Act, for the purpose of controlling air pollution

(iv) 'I has been decided fo supply nnlradec petrol to four metropolitan cities by the end of April, 1995.

(v) Miss awareness campaigns are launcherd.

(vi) Tunuu Action Plan is latmehed by the Government of India for eontroUing pollution of river Yaamns,,

(vii) tinder *tXh* Five Year Plan, the sewage treatment capacity of the Muni' cipal Onrporation of Delhi will be incrensed from 280 to 499 MGD.

Loss afferedby CPCB

1891. SHRI LAKKHIRAM AGARWAL:
Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) what her Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) has suffered a loss of Rs. 3.0 lakhs as per C&ACJ Report ended 31-3-1992 on account of procureaamt of two transformers at the risk and cost of electrical contractor;

(b) whether CPCB claim was disallowed by Arbitrator due to non-enforcement of earrc-ot clause by the Law Officer of CPCB; and

(c) if so, what action has been takes against the Law Officer of CPCB?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORBSTS (SHRI KAMAL NATH): (a) The Comptroller and Auditor General of India in his report for the year ended 31-03-1992 (No. 2 of 1993) (Scientific Departments), in respect of Central Pollution Control Board! (CPCB) has stated that, CPCB had to procure two transformers tor electric sub-station at the risk and cost of electric contractor. Difference be even cost paid (Rs. 4.54 lakhs) and tender cost (Rs. 2.58 lakhs) were recoverable from the electrical contractor. However, the Arbitrators had disallowed the claims since the correct clause was not 'enforced by Central Pollution Control Board.

(b) Yes, Sfr. The claim of CPCB was disallowed by the Arbitrators. However, CPCB has filed a suit against this Award and the matter is pending for decision in theHon'ble High Court of Delhi.

(E) Does not arise.

Losses aosTemd by GDP|UP Jal Nigamm due is non-complection of SI*T*

1092. SHRI LAKKHIRAM AGARWAL: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it Is a fact that two contract? for construction of Sewage Treat-mew Plant (STP) at Kanpur and Nairn', Ailahnbad were awarded *to* contractor M/s. Doiplex, New Delhi under Ganga AetioT! Plan Phase-I (GAP-Phase-I);

(b) if so, the progress of the Wort made so far with details thereof;